



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

her from falling into a still deeper hatred of foreigners, which will some day render her a "black terror" to the Western world.

We trust that Hon. John W. Foster, Gen. O. O. Howard and other prominent men who are leading the movement against the reenactment of the Geary law, or something worse dictated by the Pacific coast, may be able to carry the nation with them. No measure enacted by our Congress was ever more entirely based upon false assumptions and irrational demands than this, and we ought to have seen the end of it. It is an insult to a nation capable of sending to Washington such a statesman and scholar as Ambassador Wu Ting Fang to say that we will allow no more of its laboring men to come among us, and to make those already here submit to hardships in being registered, photographed and "tabbed" which we inflict on the people of no other land. Such conduct is likewise an insult to ourselves, and to all that is highest and best in our national life and history.

Death of John de Bloch.

Mr. Bloch, whose great six-volume work on "The Future of War" has stirred Europe so deeply, came suddenly into the view of the international public and has as suddenly departed. His death, which occurred at Warsaw on the 7th of January, is deeply regretted in all peace circles. Fortunately he had done his work. This will not fail to exert its influence although he has gone. It will lack, possibly, something of the vigor and impressiveness imparted by his striking and forceful personality, but it was of such a nature that it will continue to be one of the most powerful streams of influence moving to the overthrow of war.

Born a Jew in Poland, a son of the people, a pedler in his youth, saving a little money, educating himself, entering a banking house, rising rapidly, marrying a daughter of a famous banker, reaching thus great wealth and a high position socially, Mr. Bloch became a deep student of finance, of economics and sociology, a writer of a number of books, and finally one of the advisers and agents of the government in financial affairs. His banking house financed thousands of miles of state railways. He became one of the nobility and at last one of the Czar's councilors of state.

All of his great wealth, position and influence were ultimately turned to the service of peace. We have heard him tell how he became especially interested in the subject. He handled for the Russian government the transportation of the troops during the Russo-Turkish war. Speaking of conveying the wounded, sick and dead back home, he said, "I have seen what war is."

When he turned his attention to the problem of the abolishment of war, in which he had been inter-

ested in a way from his youth, he gave himself to it the last years of his life with a singleness of heart, a devotion and practical wisdom that left him without any peer in his own special line. In fact he never had a peer, or even co-worker. He created his line and worked it practically alone, and he at once showed himself to be a leader and master. At the time of the Hague Conference he was, though unofficially connected with the meeting, in many respects the most imposing figure in the Netherlands capital, and statesmen and diplomats sought introductions to him and listened to his conversations and lectures, as such men will only listen to a master. It was the same way in Paris or in London, where leading military experts sat at his feet and in spite of themselves listened to him discuss in a simple business way the problems of war at the present time. The subject had mastered him so completely that he could think and speak of nothing else, and it was difficult for any one else to say anything when he had once begun to talk.

Mr. Bloch did not approach the subject of war from the religious or the ethical point of view. It is evident that the moral character of it was deeply felt by him, and all his work had the strongest possible ethical bearings. But he felt, possibly too strongly, that the "men of affairs" could not be reached by direct ethical considerations. He therefore approached the subject from the technical and economic points of view.

The main purpose of his monumental work, in the preparation of which he spent many years and consulted many eminent European military experts, was to show that war between first-class powers has now become impossible, unless they are willing knowingly to plunge headlong into ruin. He argued with an unsurpassed wealth of illustration that with modern long-range and rapid-fire guns armies cannot face each other in battle array without mutual annihilation, that the defensive power of entrenched forces has become so great as to render the capture of forts practically impossible, and thus that wars between equals can no longer be fought to a finish.

His other great argument was that the cost of mobilizing and maintaining armies in campaign has become so great as to make bankruptcy absolutely certain, if war should, under the changed methods of fighting now rendered necessary, continue very long. He held that the war in South Africa, though only one of the contestants is a great power, has shown his reasoning to be entirely correct, both as to the increase of defensive power through modern weapons and as to the enormous expensiveness of maintaining armies in the field.

Thus he attempted to show, not that war is inhuman and morally loathsome, which he could doubtless have done with the greatest effectiveness, but that it has become supreme folly, and that nations

plunging into it under present conditions would be downright fools. Arbitration, an international court, he thus came to demand as the only rational course open, and he believed that as soon as men should see the force of his technical and economic reasoning, they would all turn naturally to this sensible method of adjusting disputes, that war would, as a matter of course, disappear, and with its disappearance would come disarmament.

It was this view presented in his work that so deeply impressed the Czar in 1897, as it has impressed many of the leading minds of Europe. The Conference at The Hague would, doubtless, have been called anyway, as Nicholas II. had already been studying the subject from the time of his father's death from many points of view. Mr. Bloch's massive logic quickened his pace and decided him to immediate action.

It is hardly correct to call Mr. Bloch's view his own, or to say that it was original with him. It is a view which has been forcing itself for years upon thoughtful minds in all civilized countries, and which before long will compel the assent of everybody. Mr. Bloch's great merit lay in the large and masterful way in which he interpreted to our time its own growing consciousness of the absurd and ruinous situation into which it has been brought by its enslavement to the old barbarous institution of war.

Nations as Gentlemen.

The Von Holleben-Pauncefote incident at the President's reception on New Year's day suggests anew the inquiry whether nations, through their chief officials and diplomatic representatives, may ever be expected to conduct themselves in matters of international etiquette as considerate and well-bred gentlemen do in private life. It has generally been held that they cannot be expected to do so, that it is impossible for nations in their mutual relations to follow any other law than that of egotism, pure and simple, with all that this implies of self-preference, truculence and stickling for place.

Certain it is that the law of egotism has been the rule in the past. What has been called "precedence" is only a peculiar artificial form of selfishness, so fixed up that everybody in gold lace and stars except the last fellow in the line is ahead of somebody else. And the last man has been happy to be last only because he has seen in imagination at some time in the future a line of less important envoys following meekly behind him. This whole matter of diplomatic precedence will some day be looked upon as quite as ridiculous a thing as knight-errantry now is when seen through the pages of Cervantes.

It is difficult even now to keep a straight face when one thinks of the tyrannical hold which it has maintained in the past. When William Penn, a

little over two hundred years ago, drew up his scheme for the peace of Europe, he had, in order to be "practical," to get over in some way the difficulty offered by this law of precedence. He provided that his diet or parliament should meet about a round table in a round house, with doors all about, that there might be no top or bottom of the room, no head or foot of the table, and all this that nobody might "precede" anybody else. But he innocently forgot that this part of the scheme was more unpractical, more ahead of the time, than any other part of it. The big diplomats, if the plan had been tried, would never have consented to allow the little ones thus to be made equal to themselves by the simple device of a round table in a round room.

Why should not the whole custom of "precedence" be thrown overboard to-day at Washington? Why should it be necessary for the oldest in service — or is it the oldest in years? — of the diplomatic corps to shake hands first with the President, in order to prevent the whole array of them from shaking their fists at each other? One of the doctrines of modern international politics is that sovereign, independent nations are equal in diplomatic rights and privileges. If the heads of legation — forty in number, more or less — are equal, why should they not all be satisfied to enter the room and shake hands with the President in any order that might chance to come about, as the same number of equal gentlemen would do in private life? Why should it not be honorable for an ambassador, and creditable to his country, for him to step back and say, "After you, sir," as a Christian gentleman would do?

Ambassador von Holleben's courtesy to Ambassador Pauncefote has raised him in the estimation of all cultivated Americans. It has at the same time increased the honor of his country much more, be it said by the way, than Chancellor von Bülow's quarreling with Mr. Chamberlain over the wires of the Associated Press. Lord Pauncefote, if he had been present at the reception, would, "according to the law," have shaken hands first with the President. But he was suffering at home with the gout, not a very comforting thing even under ordinary circumstances. The German ambassador, therefore, "according to the law," had the right to the first grasp of the President's hand. He decided to waive this right, and to treat the British ambassador as if he were present, by arranging for Lady Pauncefote to precede him in greeting Mr. Roosevelt.

It was a most thoughtful and gentleman-like thing for the German ambassador to do. We hope that his Excellency, Lord Pauncefote, one of the most unselfish diplomats in the whole field, may take the first suitable opportunity to return the courtesy. Let him, when he and the German ambassador are approaching the President at the head of the shining line of plenipotentiaries, step aside and say to Baron